



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/857,606	08/02/2001	Mats Dahlback	19378.0011	6441

7590 06/05/2006

Swidler Berlin Shereff Friedman  
Suite 300  
3000 K Street N W  
Washington, DC 20007

EXAMINER
----------

WILKINS III, HARRY D

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1742

DATE MAILED: 06/05/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE****U.S. Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

APPLICATION NO./ CONTROL NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR / PATENT IN REEXAMINATION	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
---------------------------------	-------------	---	---------------------

EXAMINER
----------

ART UNIT	PAPER
----------	-------

20060524

DATE MAILED:

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Commissioner for Patents**

The reply brief filed 14 April 2006 has been entered and considered.

The declarations attached as A and B were timely filed and considered by the Examiner during prosecution. The declarations show that a combination of higher Sn and Fe lead to a desired increase in corrosion resistance. However, since the claimed ranges of the elements Sn and Fe are anticipated by Mardon et al, the evidence in these declarations is not sufficient to overcome the rejection grounds as evidence of unexpected results cannot be relied upon to overcome an anticipation rejection.

The declaration attached as C was not timely filed during prosecution. It has been submitted for the first time as an attachment to the reply brief. For this reason it has not been entered nor considered. It is noted that the declaration C is not presented in response to the new grounds of rejection in the Examiner's answer, merely to try to rebut the rejections presented in the final rejection. Further, Appellant has not mentioned or addressed the significance of this declaration within the body of the brief so as to provide reasons why the declaration should be considered persuasive. As such, the declaration C has not been entered and considered.

The application has been forwarded to the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences for decision on the appeal.

[It is noted that Appellant titled this brief "Substitute Appeal Brief", however, it is more properly titled "Reply Brief" since it is in response to an Examiner's Answer.]

ROBERT J. WARDEN, SR.  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1700

ROY KING  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1700

Harry D. Wilkins, III  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit: 1742